**Draft Minutes**
**Superintendent's Advisory Committee**
**Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999**
**Sacramento Public Library**
**828 I Street**
**Sacramento, California**
**May 17, 1999**
**9:00 a.m.**

## MEMBERS PRESENT

Carl Cohn, Co-Chair; Superintendent, Long Beach Unified School District
Mike Aiello, Teacher, San Luis Obispo High School (EE)
Sam Araki, Former President, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Space (API)
Eva Baker, Director, Center for the Study of Evaluation (UCLA), (API, Co-Chair)
Sue Burr, Undersecretary, Office of the Secretary for Education (EE)
Mary Alice Callahan, President,Morgan Hill Federation of Teachers (EE)
Rudy Castruita, San Diego County Superintendent of Schools (API)
Holly Covin; Assistant Executive Director, Policy Analysis & Research, CSBA (EE)
Leslie DeMerssemen, President, California School Boards Association (API)
Patsy Estrellas, Teacher, Norwalk La Mirada School District/California Teachers
Association (EE)
Bob Friedman, Chief Operations Officer, California School Information Services (CSIS)
(API)
Javier Gonzales, Teacher, Pioneer High School (API)
Ed Haertel, Professor, Stanford University, School of Education (API, Co-Chair)
Jerry Hayward, Director, Policy Analysis for California Education (EE)
Janett Humphries, President, SEIU Local 99, Los Angeles Unified School District (EE)<
Jere Jacobs, Former Assistant Vice President, Pacific Telesis (API)
>Kelvin Lee, Superintendent, Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District (EE, Co-Chair)
Sidney Morrison, Principal, Arnold Elementary School/ACSA State President (EE)
Lynette Nyaggah, Teacher, Rio Hondo College (EE)
Dolores Ochoa, Parent, State Parent Advisory Board (EE)
Jeff Orlinsky, Teacher, Warren High School (API)
Scott Plotkin, Chief Consultant and Staff Director, Senate Education Committee (API)
Tamara Powers, Parent (API)
Shelly Spiegel-Coleman, ESL Consultant, Los Angeles County Office of Education (EE)
Irene Sumida, Co-Director, Fenton Avenue Charter School (EE)
Rene Townsend, Professor/Consultant, CSU San Marcos, College of Education (EE)
Charles Weis, Ventura County Superintendent of Schools (EE)
Lynn Wilen, Superintendent, Reef Sunset Unified School District (API)
Arnie Ziegler, State Secretary, California State Parent-Teacher Association (EE)

## MEMBERS ABSENT

Pat Pineda, Co-Chair; Vice President, Legal, Environmental, and Government Affairs,
NUMMI

Vicki Barber, El Dorado County Superintendent of Schools (EE)
Tom Boysen, Senior Vice President, Education, Milken Family Foundation (API)
FACE="Times">General Davie, Jr., Superintendent, San Juan Unified School District
(EE, Co-Chair)
Eugene Garcia, Dean, Graduate School of Education, University of California Berkeley
(API)
Jeanette Morgan, Director, Governmental Affairs, National Semiconductor Corporation
(API)
Bill Ouchi, Vice-Dean, Anderson School, University of California at Los Angeles (EE)
Ernesto Ruiz, Director, Migrant Education, Region 2, Butte County Office of Education
(API)
Linda Strickland, Board Member, California School Employees Association (API)
Rosie Thompson, Business Unit Executive, IBM Global Education
(API - Academic Performance Index Subcommittee)
(EE - External Evaluators Subcommittee)

## STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION LIAISONS ABSENT

Marian Bergeson
Susan Hammer

## PRINCIPAL STAFF TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

William Padia, Director, Office of Policy and Evaluation

Hanna Walker, Director, District and School Support Division
Laura Wagner, Manager, School Support Teams Office

Call to Order
Awaiting the arrival of Mr. Cohn, Mr. Padia called the meeting to order at 9:14 a.m. He
invited Mr. McCabe to address administrative details for the meeting.

Administrative Matters.
Mr. McCabe described the materials in the members' agenda packets, outlined the
process for executing the Oath of Office by the new members, distributed a
comprehensive membership list (noting that the list included certain information of a
confidential nature), and briefly went over the State Board of Education May agenda item
relating to PSAA implementation.

Informal Introductions/Greetings.
Mr. Padia invited the new members to introduce themselves informally, noting that the
formal round of introductions should await Mr. Cohn's arrival. Following that, he invited
the audience members to introduce themselves. Mr. Padia noted that the plan for the day
included only a brief full session at the beginning and end and indicated that most of the
day would be spent in the subcommittees. He emphasized the importance of more
subcommittee time due to the complex nature of the issues being addressed and the very

short time line in which they must be resolved"We are moving at warp speed!"

Review of May State Board
of Education meeting. Mr. Padia noted that the May State Board meeting was really the first presentation of substantive issues. In April, staff had given the State Board an overview of the bill and PSAA Committee's formation. He commented that the heart of the presentation involved a report on the Committee's April 26 meeting and the recommendations that emerged therefrom. He invited Hanna Walker, Director of the District and School Support Division, to address issues pertaining to underperforming schools and external evaluators.

Ms. Walker reviewed the information given to State Board on external evaluators, which is a part of the Immediate Interventions and Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP). It included standards and criteria; minimum qualifications; and proposed application process. She noted some areas where the State Board wanted the minimum qualifications clarified and/or strengthened. Mr. Plotkin indicated that it had always been the Legislature's intent to his recollection that internal district staff could be considered for appointment as external evaluators; he suggested that the EE Subcommittee might wish to revisit the exclusion of internal staff. Mr. Lee pointed out that it may be impossible particularly in small districts for internal staff to provide the type of impartial, dispassionate evaluation that underperforming schools need.

Mr. Padia indicated that the Department's Legal Office had been asked about the PSAA member conflict of interest issue that had been raised by the State Board. He indicated that the Legal Office suggested a "wait and see" approach, acknowledging that the combination of certain conditions could trigger a requirement for Committee members to file Form 700 (in which any potential conflicts are disclosed). He also pointed out that State Board member Kathryn Dronenburg had commented on the absence of any knowledge of special education issues in the minimum qualifications for external evaluators. He also pointed out that State Board member Marion Joseph suggested that the term "demonstrated success" in the minimum qualifications was vague and she was concerned that external evaluators have evidence of recent successful experiences in underperforming schools.

Mr. Padia proceeded to address the issues pertaining to the API that were considered and acted upon by the State Board. He noted that the State Board approved the methodology for selection of schools to allow the early notification of possible eligibility for the II/USP based on 1998 STAR results (as had been recommended by the Committee and the State Superintendent). He discussed the six elements: (1) early notification; (2) definition of measurement scale; (3) STAR content areas; (4) identification of grade level category; (5) mobility in 1998 and 1999; and (6) the small school definition. He mentioned that State Board member Marian Bergeson noted the critical importance of how the information is "rolled out" on underperforming schoolsit must be communicated in both a thoughtful and timely way. He also explained the weighting of STAR content areas.

Formal Introductions. At 9:40 a.m., Mr. Cohn, having arrived, invited all members and key staff present to introduce themselves. They did so, including Chief Deputy Superintendent Leslie Fausset who had joined the group.

Time Line. At Mr. Cohn's invitation, Mr. McCabe discussed the time line for actions that must be taken over the next several months. It is extremely tight, particularly for the selection of schools to participate in the II/USP. Mr. Ziegler inquired as to whether local boards had to approve participation. Ms. Walker replied that for the CSRD, they do. Mr. McCabe noted that local board involvement was a critical factor in providing early notification; districts need to have an idea of which schools are likely to qualify. Ms. Townsend and Mr. Jacobs also emphasized the vital nature of early notification. Mr. Cohn indicated that the API Subcommittee would report out on its meeting earlier in the month during the afternoon full Committee session. He suggested that the planned full Committee meeting for June 7 meeting be canceled because of its proximity to the State Board's June meeting. By consensus, it was so agreed. Mr. Padia indicated that the State Board designated Susan Hammer and Marian Bergeson as the liaisons to the Committee, but neither were able to attend this day's session. Ms. Spiegel-Coleman inquired as to whether the June 28 meeting should be rescheduled. Mr. Padia indicated that there was sufficient time between the June 28 meeting and the State Board's agenda deadline for the July meeting to enable staff to turn around any necessary documents.

Mr. Cohn and Mr. Padia discussed the technical design group that will support and assist the other subcommittees; Mr. Haertel and Ms. Baker will chair. Mr. Padia mentioned the names of several individuals who had agreed to serve; CDE is still searching for additional members for that group.

ELL Issues.
Ms. Spiegel-Coleman indicated that she would like to see a special group focus on issues related to English Language Learner (ELL) students; she commented that she had asked Mr. Garcia whether he would be willing to chair such a group and that he indicated he would if such was the Committee's desire. Mr. Cohn suggested that ELL issues might better be discussed within the scope of the API Subcommittee's work. Ms. Spiegel-Coleman commented that a smaller group might be a more efficient way of tackling these complicated issues, because the time of the API Subcommittee appeared quite limited. Mr. Haertel suggested that the April 26 meeting of the API Subcommittee was atypical because of the "steep learning curve" all the members were facing. He indicated that he felt confident the API Subcommittee could fully and completely address ELL issues in its regular meetings. Mr. Hayward emphasized that ELL issues are very important and that they should be dealt with in the API Subcommittee, not relegated to a separate group. Mr. Castruita and Mr. Jacobs emphasized their view that ELL issues had "to be a priority." Mr. Haertel reiterated his feeling that there will be time to address these issues in API Subcommittee. Ms. Nyaggah asked if a means could be found for those interested in ELL issues to join the API Subcommittee when ELL issues are discussed, noting her own specialized qualifications in the area of language development. Mr. Cohn indicated that flexibility would be provided for other interested members to join in the discussions of the API Subcommittee on ELL issues. He emphasized, however, that the guarantee to

address ELL issues did not also guarantee an outcome that would be satisfactory to everyone. For purposes of this day's meeting, it was agreed that the API Subcommittee would address ELL issues beginning at 2:00 p.m. with all members welcome to join the group; reconvening of the full Committee will be extended to 3:00 p.m.

Legislative Background. Ms. DeMerssemen indicated that she would appreciate getting more of a feeling of the legislative intent behind certain aspects of the PSAA. How much, for example, is "Steering by Results" to guide the work of the API subcommittee? Mr. Plotkin briefly outlined the legislative background and history of the PSAA. He indicated that they had begun by setting out to identify a set of indicators that would provide objective, reliable information about school conditions, and that this search had been the genesis of the idea for the API Subcommittee. He said that the measures certainly were to include test results, but also "as many multiple measures as possible to ensure a full reflection of conditions at a school." The intent was to mitigate effects of one test score as the full measure of a school's performance. He pointed out that the lack of data other than test scores (as discussed at the April 26 meeting) made it impossible to enlist a full range of information.

As "the best second step," said Mr. Plotkin, the idea emerged to disaggregate available data to determine the success or failure of schools. This idea led to development of the external evaluator process. Disaggregated data are unique to each school, but are useful in the "front-end phase" of analysis and improvement planning. The legislation also has the "relief valve" of State Board intervention where oddities occur, e.g., a good overall score, but some subgroups of students doing very poorly. He noted that in Texas the exploration of mitigating factors was found to be interesting but not very practical, e.g., not consistent from school to school. He concluded that the API should be simple but that the data should be broken out in considerable detail. Mr. Cohn inquired whether the goal is to bring "everyone into the mainstream." Mr. Plotkin confirmed that the goal is "to bring underperforming schools up and not leave anybody behind."

Ms. Burr relayed Governor Davis' view that the API had to be kept simple. She noted that the PSAA is very similar to the Texas model. She commented that the Governor is convinced that test score data are the only data we'll have in the foreseeable future, and he's comfortable with that. She pointed out that, while "Steering by Results" was the guiding document for Senator Leslie's bill of last year (that was vetoed by Governor Wilson), Governor Davis felt the long term growth target in that report to be unfair. Governor Davis feels all schools should be rewarded for growth from their baseline; the plan should not include long-term targets that are overly daunting.

Mr. Araki (who chaired the advisory committee that developed "Steering by Results") indicated that he had come at the task from an industrial background. Industry has had to go through major reforms in the last five years; he discussed the psychology of implementing change. He suggested that the API needs to be kept simple and easy to understand. He also suggested that, while it is important to take corrective action on school problems, it is equally important to recognize and build on successes. It is psychologically imperative to reward success. Schools that succeed under extraordinary

conditions are good role models.

Ms. Spiegel-Coleman inquired about the Governor's view of the long term for school accountability. Ms. Burr indicated that he would have to be convinced of the cost-benefit of investing in the data system; at this point, the costs seem overwhelming. The Governor is unsure the investment is worth it. Mr. Haertel inquired about non-test outcomes. Mr. Plotkin noted that with CSIS implementation five to seven years away, the data for non-test outcomes just do not seem viable. Ms. Burr suggested that there are a small number of indicators that have a direct relationship to pupil achievement. She also commented that ranking of schools with similar demographics is appropriate. Ms. Baker suggested that we need to be wary that the accountability system we create does not reinforce inappropriate assumptions, e.g., assuming that SES always predicts achievement.

Mr. Plotkin again pointed out his recollection that legislative intent with respect to external evaluators was that they be external to the school, but not necessarily external to the district. Mr. Cohn asked if it would be acceptable to require that they be external to the district. Mr. Plotkin indicated that choice was open to the Committee under the legislation. Ms. Burr went further to suggest that the examples cited in the bill seems to imply that the evaluators should be external to district, but, she too, indicated that the decision is the committee's. Ms. Wilen commented on the relative cost difference of external evaluators to small, rural schools versus large, urban schools in terms of external evaluators. Mr. Lee responded that the External Evaluators Subcommittee's intent was not "to hit any school with all of the costs," but he indicated that underperforming schools had to reprioritize their spending, and at least part of the cost of external evaluation had to be found in that reprioritization.

As the morning full Committee session drew to a close, Mr. Padia mentioned the e-mail address for those wishing to send material to all PSAA committee members.

Recess.
Mr. Cohn recessed the full Committee at 10:42 a.m., indicating there would be a 10-minute break following by the Subcommittee sessions. The full Committee would reconvene at approximately 3:00 p.m. Mr. Padia reconvened the full Committee at 3:12 p.m.

Report of the External Evaluators Subcommittee. Ms. Estrellas gave the report of the External Evaluators Subcommittee. Regarding minimum qualifications for external evaluators, she elaborated on the requirement for recent successful experience in improving student achievement. A rubric to evaluate the experience is to be developed by CDE Staff; it will emphasize recent experience and multiple sources of measurement data. She reported that a criterion is to be included regarding demonstrated experience in working with diverse (racial, ethnic, socio-economic, linguistic, and programmatic) student populations, including ELL, special education, GATE, and others. She reported that the subcommittee recommends that the application process begin with state paper-screening and include regional interviews. She reported that the Subcommittee revisited the issue of external evaluators being from within a district (though not from within the

school being evaluated). The recommendation is to allow districts who wish to look within for an external evaluator, to hold a public hearing at a local governing board meeting and state their justification for using an external evaluator internal to the district. Finally, she reported on means for recruiting external evaluators.

The next EE Subcommittee will meet on June 28 in conjunction with the full Committee meeting and will probably be given new tasks.

Report of the API Subcommittee. Mr. Jacobs gave the report of API Subcommittee. He discussed the role of the technical design group and a set of principles to guide long-term design work. He emphasized that validity is key a issue. He outlined key questions, e.g., What is the scale of measurement? How can additional areas be accommodated? How can other measures be incorporated to promote positive ends? He pointed out that there are some very difficult issues to address in relation to ELL students. The API Subcommittee will meet again May 26.

Mr. Haertel mentioned the ongoing concern about bringing "non-cognitive indicators" into API. Mr. Jacobs outlined the basic argument for and against so doing.

Mr. Cohn asked if there was any public comment prior to the full Committee's adjournment. There was none.

Adjournment. Mr. Cohn adjourned the full Committee at 3:27 p.m. He indicated that the API Subcommittee would continue its discussions for an additional 30 minutes or so.

Respectfully submitted,


Greg Geeting
Recording Secretary

During the final 30 minutes of the scheduled full committee meeting, the API Subcommittee reconvened and was joined by the remaining members of the External Evaluators Subcommittee. Discussion ensued concerning issues surrounding the use of the SABE/2 in the API.

**Highlights:**

Changes in testing policy and criteria would make 1999 test results not comparable to results from subsequent years.

In the future, SAT9 results may be reported only for ELL students who have been in this country at least 24 months (our current exclusion policy requires 12 months in the district).

SABE/2 is used only when pupils are instructed in Spanish if in county for more than 12 months.

Some large districts use primary language tests other than the SABE/2 which would make the use of these data inequitable.

SABE/2 is not aligned with state content standards.

Use of the SABE/2 has been approved by the SBE for one year only, 1999.

The same SABE/2 test is used for multiple grades

- Grades 5 and 6
- Grades 7-11.

There was consensus in the API subcommittee to not include the SABE/2 in the 1999-2000 API.

Respectfully submitted,


Patrick McCabe